



# PROPOSAL EVALUATION

## IRWM Grant Program – Planning Grant, Round 2, FY 2011-2012

<b>Applicant</b>	San Luis and Delta Mendota Water Authority	<b>County</b>	San Joaquin, Stanislaus, Merced, Fresno & Kings
<b>Project Title</b>	Westside-San Joaquin IRWM Plan Update	<b>Grant Request</b>	\$305,195
		<b>Total Project Cost</b>	\$425,880

**Project Description** The update of the Westside Integrated Water Resources Plan (WIWRP) will revise the adopted plan to meet new IRWM plan standards, continue outreach to expand stakeholder and DAC participation, provide technical assistance to projects benefitting DACs, assess the region's vulnerability to climate change, update the analysis of water supply and demand, clarify the process to identify, integrate and prioritize projects, review and revise plan objectives, update plan maps, conduct stakeholder meetings and workshops as part of the plan update process, and expand the information available about the WIWRP on the Water Authority's website.

### Evaluation Summary

Scoring Criterion	Score
Work Plan	9
DAC Involvement	6
Schedule	5
Budget	6
Program Preferences	5
Tie Breaker	0
<b>Total Score</b>	<b>31</b>

- **Work Plan** The criterion is less than fully addressed and documentation or rationales are incomplete or insufficient. The Work Plan contains the two required sections, and the section on additional work performed, as defined in the PSP. The required Current Status Section contains a complete list of IRWM Plan Standards, along with a description of how each standard is currently met and unmet. However, the description for Plan Standards 7 through 11, 13, and 15, provides little explanation of the current status or what is required. For example, the description for how Plan Standard 7 (Impacts and Benefits) is currently met is "the adopted Plan includes a discussion of potential impacts and benefits of Plan implementation." Also, Task 2 does not define "continued" outreach or explain what "activities" would occur prior to workshops/milestones. For tasks 2 and 3, it may be appropriate to include drafting a summary of outreach efforts and results in order to demonstrate that the task has been completed. For Task 9, sufficient detail is not provided to demonstrate that the work will result in an IRWM Plan that meets the IRWM Plan Standards. Task 8 constitutes by far the largest task cost share but has less detail relative to other tasks. Furthermore, as Task 8 is currently described it is not eligible for Planning Grant funds. Task 8 states that it will provide technical assistance (via consultant?) to, as many as, seven DAC projects that did not score well in the region's IRWM Plan project prioritization process to help make the projects more competitive for future implementation grant applications. Potential services are bulleted, but specific activities are not detailed. It is not clear how this work improves or makes the IRWM plan standards compliant. It appears to be the formation of a capacity grant which DWR is not permitted to fund. Nor can DWR provide funding to a region to prepare for another State grant solicitation.
- **DAC Involvement** The criterion is less than fully addressed and documentation is insufficient. DAC outreach is specifically addressed in Tasks 3 and 8, and is also addressed as a part of Tasks 4, 7, 9, and 10,



# PROPOSAL EVALUATION

## *IRWM Grant Program – Planning Grant, Round 2, FY 2011-2012*

---

with little explanation as to how DAC involvement would occur or will be sustained. For example, on Task 3, pg 10-11 (Continued Focused Outreach to DACs), it is stated that Community Water Center and Self Help Industries will be utilized, but there are no details on what these organizations will be doing or their approach.

- **Schedule** The criterion is fully addressed and supported by thorough and well-presented documentation and logical rationale. The timing and duration of these scheduled items seem appropriate when compared to the Work Plan and to the Budget. The schedule covers each of the 12 tasks identified in the Work Plan and with the 12 Budget Task line items. The schedule provides a detailed timeline for meetings and the submission of deliverables, and it corresponds with the tasks detailed in the Work Plan.
- **Budget** The criterion is less than fully addressed and documentation is insufficient. The Budget contains a lump sum for reimbursable costs including mileage, travel, printing, postage, and other miscellaneous costs, but it does not state which task will incur these costs. Matching funds are entered as a lump sum at the bottom of the budget estimate. In both cases, a justification for why a lump sum cost estimate is valid is not made. Matching funds are categorized as either "In-Kind" or "Local Funds," but it is unclear how the matching funds will be applied to each task.
- **Program Preference** The application sufficiently documents that 11 of the 15 preferences will be met.
- **Tie Breaker** Not Applicable.